United Nations A/AC.109/2005/SR.8

General Assembly

Distr.: General
22 June 2005

Original: English

Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Summary record of the 8th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 15 June 2005, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Hunte ..... (Saint Lucia)

Contents

Adoption of the agenda

Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)

Hearing of representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territory

Hearing of petitioners

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

05-38515 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

1. *The agenda was adopted.*

Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) (A/AC.109/2005/17, A/AC.109/2005/L.8)

2. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay had indicated their wish to participate in the Committee's consideration of the item. In accordance with established practice and since there were no objections, he invited the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay to take places at the Committee table.

Hearing of representatives of the Non-Self-Governing Territory

3. *At the invitation of the Chairman and in accordance with the requests for hearing granted at previous meetings of the Committee, Mr. Birmingham (Member of the Legislative Council of the Falkland Islands) and Mr. Luxton (Member of the Legislative Council of the Falkland Islands) took places at the Committee table.*

4. **Mr. Birmingham** (Member of the Legislative Council of the Falkland Islands) said that Argentina continued to believe that it owned the Falkland Islands. The islands belonged to the people who lived on them; many families had lived there for more than 170 years. The islanders could not understand why the United Nations was unable to accept that, the situation in small States and territories had changed enormously. The Falkland Islands were an internally self-governing territory, working in partnership with the United Kingdom. Functioning like a city state, with no corruption and up-to-date legal and education systems and medical services, they were self-funded, with the exception of defence, which was the responsibility of the United Kingdom. People visited the Falkland Islands from all over the world. Referring to the recent visit to a new cemetery on the islands by a delegation of relatives of Argentine servicemen who had died during the 1982 invasion, he said that, contrary to reports, the Falkland Islands had never denied access to relatives.

5. During the past two years, the Argentine Government had gone out of its way to make life more difficult for the Falkland Islands, by — inter alia — banning charter flights to the islands, encouraging the Argentine fishing fleet to fish close to the Falkland Islands' zone, actively seeking to frustrate self-government in the islands and attempting to prevent islanders from sitting on international bodies and attending trade fairs. Their efforts had simply led more countries to see the current Argentine Government as a bully.

6. At the end of their recent visit to the Falkland Islands, a group of Canadian politicians had expressed the view that the islanders had the right to decide their own future, while deploring the Argentine Government's hostile attitude and expressing surprise that the Committee constantly failed to support that right. While he regretted that the Falkland Islands had not been able to attend the 2005 regional seminar in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, he expressed his appreciation to the opposition leader in Gibraltar, for intervening on behalf of the islanders when the representative of Argentina had tried to deny them their rights. Referring to the statement by the Chief Minister of Gibraltar that it was the people that mattered, he said that, if Spain could open up and accept that Gibraltarians had rights, it was time for Argentina to recognize that the islanders did too.

7. Recalling that, at the 2003 regional seminar in Anguilla, the then Chairman of the Committee had noted that the Committee's role was not to seek to persuade the people of Non-Self-Governing Territories to change their current arrangements, but rather to inform them about their options, he expressed confidence that, with time, the Committee would accept that times had changed and that the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories had rights under the Charter of the United Nations, the most fundamental of which was the right to self-determination.

8. Lastly, he expressed gratitude to those countries and delegations that continued to support the islanders in their struggle for recognition of their right to self-determination. Such countries and delegations obviously understood the purpose of the Committee and were happy to see former colonies moving towards a future of their own choosing and at their own pace. In that regard, he invited the Committee to send a delegation to the November 2005 elections so that it

could see for itself how elections were held in a microcommunity such as the Falkland Islands.

9. **Mr. Luxton** (Member of the Legislative Council of the Falkland Islands) said that, while today's Argentine Government might be democratic, its stance towards his country had not changed significantly since the military dictatorship of 1982, save for the fact that overt military aggression did not seem to be on the agenda. Its hostility simply strengthened the islanders' resolve to remain British. In his view, a truly democratic country would recognize the islanders' right to determine their own future.

10. The draft resolution referred to the maintenance of colonial situations. The Falkland Islands had already been decolonized, for they had already achieved the level of independence they desired and enjoyed a relationship with the United Kingdom based on partnership, prosperity, consultation and dialogue; they were, in fact, an internally self-governing and largely self-sufficient British overseas territory. They were British — that was what they wanted. The inhabitants had nothing in common with Argentina culturally, linguistically, historically or politically. The concept of territorial integrity promoted by Argentina was complete nonsense and seemed to confuse territorial integrity with geographical proximity. The inhabitants of the Falkland Islands enjoyed a fully democratic Government and were responsible for every element of their country's well-being, save exception of foreign affairs and defence. They also enjoyed an excellent education and health service, a prosperous business community, considerable investment in capital infrastructure, an exemplary fishing industry, a growing offshore mineral industry, a transparent and competitive fiscal regime and a growing tourist industry. Argentina's concerted efforts to disrupt that industry by imposing an economic blockade on non-scheduled charter flights to the islands was completely unacceptable and should cause outrage at the United Nations. The Falkland Islands would never again hand over control of their critical services to an Argentine Government.

11. The islanders would never be persuaded that Argentina's claim that the islands had been illegally occupied by the British for 170 years was valid. British settlers had first arrived in the islands in the 1700s, long before Argentina had been granted independence. Turning the clocks back to the early nineteenth century and re-drawing borders accordingly was not a practical solution anywhere in the world. Indeed, if that were to be done, many Committee members would lose their own independence.

12. Self-determination was about allowing people to choose their own future without external influence. Argentina's complete disregard for the islanders' views challenged the Committee's very purpose. Its claim that the inhabitants of the Falkland Islands were not entitled to self-determination because they were not a distinct people was unfounded, for many islanders could trace their island ancestry back many generations. The Falkland Islands, unlike Argentina, had never had an indigenous population. He therefore respectfully submitted that the islanders had more right to live in the Falkland Islands than Argentine citizens did to live in Argentina. Emphasizing that the Falkland Islands were a long-established community with every right to choose their own future, he said that there would never be any negotiations on British sovereignty over the islands for the inhabitants had no desire to change the status quo. He called on the Committee to dismiss the draft resolution in its current form, as well as any future resolution that did not contain the right to self-determination of the Falkland Islands as its principal reference, and to reject Argentina's clear attempts to bring about a change in sovereignty.

13. *Mr. Birmingham and Mr. Luxton withdrew.*

Hearing of petitioners

14. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Lewis took a place at the petitioners' table.*

15. **Mr. Lewis** said that he was a native of the Malvinas Islands but, like many islanders, had lived on the Argentine mainland from a young age. Recalling that the first governor of his province had encouraged settlers to move to the mainland, he said that the many islanders who had moved to Argentina at that time — including his own ancestors — had led a life similar to that on the islands and, like immigrants from all over the world, had become fully integrated into the Argentine way of life. Trade had been — and could again be — conducted with the islands, with mutual benefits. Pointing to the need for cooperation on fishing, oil exploration, sheep farming and tourism, he said that the islands, an important tourist attraction, could be included in tourist packages alongside Argentina's national parks, in order to raise the potential of the whole region, while islanders would no

doubt be interested in the various agricultural shows that took place on the mainland. While much had changed in the 18 years since he had first addressed the United Nations, the deadlock continued.

16. Recalling that the General Assembly had overruled the islands' right to self-determination on the basis that the islanders could not be considered a people because the islands had been legitimately inhabited by Argentines when the United Kingdom had taken them by force in 1833, he said that — in addition — Argentina's sovereignty rights, inherited from Spain, had never been opposed in previous treaties between Argentina and the United Kingdom, making it clear that the only outcome acceptable to Argentina was the recognition of those rights. The fact that Argentina had, in 1994, amended its Constitution to include steps to safeguard the islanders' way of life demonstrated its political will to work towards that claim in peace. Having lived in the region all his life and seen the potential benefits for the whole region of a just and definitive settlement, he asked the Committee to once again call on both sides to negotiate an end to the dispute.

17. *Mr. Lewis withdrew.*

18. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Vernet took a place at the petitioners' table.*

19. **Mr. Vernet** said that, as an Argentine citizen, the great-great-grandson of the first Argentine governor of the Malvinas Islands and a descendant of Argentine citizens who had peacefully populated the islands before being expelled by force, he had come to the Committee to reaffirm that the Malvinas Islands were an integral part of the Argentine national territory, to call for a negotiated end to their colonial status and the ongoing sovereignty dispute, and to explain what the islands meant for the Argentine people and how they had acquired their rights over that part of the national territory.

20. In the 1820s, the first president of the Argentine Republic, Bernardino Rivadavia, had signed a decree authorizing his great-great-grandfather, Don Luis Vernet, to raise livestock in the eastern island (Soledad de Malvinas) with a view to exporting hides to Europe, thereby setting in motion the organized occupation of the islands by Argentine citizens. The Argentine Republic had inherited its rights over the islands from Spain and, following independence, had carried out various acts of sovereignty, such as raising the Argentine flag; no State had protested. Moreover, when the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation between the United Provinces of Rio de la Plata and the United Kingdom had been signed, in 1825, no reservations had been expressed concerning the concession granted to Vernet. One year later, Vernet had taken his entire family and 50 horses to the islands with the intention of settling permanently in the flourishing town of Puerto Soledad, which he renamed Puerto Luis, and begun exporting a number of products to Buenos Aires and Europe. The Argentine Government was well aware that Vernet was opening up previously unexploited trading areas and in 1829 — in response to Vernet's request that it should establish a local authority in the islands to make it easier for islanders to obtain the papers needed to repulse territorial aspirations by third parties — had made him Governor of the Malvinas Islands, Tierra del Fuego and the South Atlantic. The fact that the deed of appointment had been not only notarized by Argentina's chief notary, but also legalized by the British vice-consul proved that the latter had found the acts of administration to be correct in the use of the territorial dominion exercised in the islands and lodged no claim over those titles.

21. After providing yet more evidence that Argentine citizens had lived peacefully in the Malvinas Islands until their forceful expulsion in 1833, he said that the claim by citizens of British origin that they had a right to self-determination was based on an illegitimate act of usurpation. While acknowledging that — given the illegality of colonialism and the invalidity of colonial titles, as recognized by the international community — people under colonial or foreign domination should freely choose their future legal status, he said that, in cases such as the Malvinas Islands where there was an underlying sovereignty issue owing to the fact that there was no one people with a right to self-determination, the correct application of the principle required the territory concerned to be reintegrated into the State from which it had been separated. The principle of self-determination was valid only for people subjected to a colonial power, not for the descendants of people illegally transplanted by such a power, and would be distorted if it were interpreted in that way. He therefore called on the Committee to urge the United Kingdom to resume negotiations with the Argentine Republic, as called for in all the General Assembly's resolutions on the matter.

22. *Mr. Vernet withdrew.*

23. **Mr. Muñoz** (Chile), speaking also on behalf of Bolivia, Cuba and Venezuela, introduced draft resolution A/AC.109/2005/L.8 and drew attention to paragraphs 1 and 4. The presence of a considerable number of representatives from Latin American countries underscored the interest that the countries of the region had in the matter. The sponsors supported Argentina's rights in the dispute over the sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and felt that the only path for resolving the dispute was through bilateral negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom. They hoped that the draft would be adopted by consensus.

24. **Mr. Bielsa** (Minister of Foreign Affairs, International Trade, and Worship of Argentina) expressed his Government's full support for the decolonization process being carried out by the United Nations. His country had a special interest in the successful and final completion of that process and was fully convinced that such a goal could be achieved with the cooperation of all members of the Committee. The question of the Malvinas Islands had been defined by the Committee as a special and particular colonial situation. Its special nature derived from the fact that the United Kingdom had occupied the Islands by force in 1833, ousting the Argentine population and authorities established on the Islands and replacing them with settlers of British origin. Argentina had never consented to the acts of force that had given rise to the Malvinas question; mere passage of time did not generate rights either in favour of a colonial Power occupying foreign territories or in favour of its subjects settled there, regardless of the name that the colonial Power might give to the territories.

25. General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX), established that the question of the Malvinas Islands referred to a sovereignty dispute between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom that would have to be resolved through negotiations between both Governments, taking into account the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and resolution 1514 (XV) and the interests of the population of the Islands. Among other things, such consideration entailed respect for their properties, culture and way of life and it excluded the principle of self-determination, which was only applicable to subjugated or dominated peoples and not to the descendants of a population transferred by the occupying Power. In that connection, in 1985 the General Assembly had expressly rejected the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom that aimed at including the principle of self-determination in the relevant draft resolution. However, recalling paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), he stressed that the principle of territorial integrity should be applied to the question of the Malvinas Islands.

26. He deplored the fact that Mr. Birmingham had referred to the Argentine people as a bullying administration and also objected to Mr. Luxton's comparison of the present Government to the military government at the time of the invasion.

27. The recovery of full sovereignty, while respecting the way of life of the inhabitants of the Islands in accordance with international law, was a principle set forth in the Argentine Constitution. President Néstor Kirchner, speaking at the opening session of the National Congress in March 2005, had stressed the Government's firm commitment to seeking the recovery of full sovereignty over the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime spaces. Despite the repeated calls from the international community for the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations on sovereignty without delay, and his Government's repeatedly expressed willingness to do so, the United Kingdom had persisted in its rejection, thereby delaying the decolonization process to which the Committee was committed. He therefore urged the United Kingdom to respond to the international community's repeated calls to resume negotiations.

28. Since 1989, the two countries had reached provisional understandings under the sovereignty formula on practical aspects in the disputed geographical area. Among them were understandings on confidence-building measures in the military sphere, conservation of fishing resources, exploration of hydrocarbons, air and sea access and communications with the Malvinas Islands, and the construction of a war memorial at Darwin for the Argentines fallen in the 1982 conflict. His Government had applied those understandings in a spirit of cooperation with a view to resuming negotiations towards achieving a final, fair and peaceful solution to the dispute. For that reason, the understandings could not be assumed as acceptance of any claimed status

quo in the area of dispute, nor could they be a substitute for a definitive solution to the question.

29. Despite his Government's willingness to cooperate, the United Kingdom had continued to carry out a number of unilateral actions contrary to the spirit of those understandings and had failed to respect the terms of General Assembly resolution 31/49, which called on both parties to refrain from introducing unilateral modifications into the situation. His Government continued to protest against and to reject all unilateral actions concerning the territory under dispute, including seismic prospecting for hydrocarbons and the sale of fishing licences in the area under dispute. Further such actions had recently included attempts to assert an international presence for the Malvinas Islands as a separate entity from Argentina, to confer upon its government a status that it did not have and to extend international conventions to the disputed area. In that respect, he drew attention to document A/60/71/Add.1, which contained a detailed summary of the situation and the basis for his country's position with regard to the question of the Malvinas Islands. His delegation welcomed the draft resolution presented by Chile and hoped that it would help contribute to a definitive solution to the question of the Malvinas Islands.

30. **Mr. Sardenberg** (Observer for Brazil), speaking on behalf of the Rio Group, said that the Group continued to support the Special Committee's efforts to eradicate colonialism on the basis of the principles enunciated in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

31. Although progress had undoubtedly been made between the 1960s and the present in achieving that goal, it was also apparent that the work was not yet completed and that further efforts by the international community were necessary, as a result of which the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism had been declared. The Plan of Action for the Second International Decade contained an appeal to complete the process of decolonizing non-self-governing territories through exercising the right to self-determination or through consultations and negotiations between concerned States to solve heretofore unresolved problems. It was in that spirit of reconciliation that the question of the Malvinas Islands should also be resolved, in connection with which it was necessary to settle the sovereignty dispute, as indicated in resolutions 2065 (XX) and 3160 (XXVIII), as well as in other General Assembly resolutions. Given that, the countries of the Rio Group felt it necessary that the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom should resume negotiations in order to find as quickly as possible a peaceful, just, and final solution to the dispute involving the sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia, and the South Sandwich Islands, in accordance with the General Assembly and Special Committee resolutions.

32. Speaking as a representative of his own country, he said that Brazil supported the rights of Argentina in the sovereignty dispute. The United Kingdom and the Argentine Republic had agreed upon a series of provisional understandings in various areas, which would undoubtedly help to increase contact and mutual understanding between the inhabitants of the Argentine Republic and the Malvinas Islands. He hoped that the understandings could be extended so that the dispute involving sovereignty over those archipelagos and the surrounding waters would be resolved through negotiations, which the United Nations and the countries of South America had called for many times.

33. The General Assembly of the Organization of American States had recently issued a Declaration on the Question of the Malvinas Islands (Falkland Islands), in which it reiterated the need to begin negotiations as soon as possible, to resolve the protracted sovereignty dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom. In addition, the Declaration on the Question of the Malvinas Islands, which was adopted at the tenth session of the presidents of the countries of the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR), stated that the MERCOSUR countries again declared their support for the lawful rights of Argentina in the dispute involving sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and pointed out that a speedy resolution of that protracted dispute on the basis of United Nations and Organization of American States resolutions would serve the interests of the entire region.

34. Moreover, an August-September 2000 meeting of the presidents of the countries of South America in Brazil noted that the Malvinas Islands continued to be a colony, which was incompatible with the ideals of peace, security, and cooperation on the subcontinent, and called for a speedy resumption of the negotiations to find a peaceful, final solution to the sovereignty dispute.

35. Brazil welcomed the improvements noted in the working paper prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.109/2005/17), but regretted that the General Assembly resolutions on the need for comprehensive negotiations over the Malvinas Islands had still not been implemented. Given that, it firmly supported the draft resolution presented by Chile and hoped that it would be adopted without a vote.

36. **Ms. Matsuo de Claverol** (Observer for Paraguay) speaking on behalf of the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR) and the associated States of Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela reaffirmed their support for the right to self-determination, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee and their unconditional support for the rights of Argentina in the dispute involving sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands.

37. They reiterated the need for the parties to take into account the interests of the population of Malvinas and called on the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations in order to find a peaceful, just and lasting solution as soon as possible. They hoped that would be adopted by consensus.

38. **Ms. Tincopa Grados** (Observer for Peru) said that while her country had always defended the right of peoples to self-determination, the present case was different from that of most other non-self-governing territories. The position of her delegation, based on historical, geographical and legal criteria was that the sovereignty of the Argentine Republic over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and surrounding maritime areas should be recognized, as stated in General Assembly resolutions 2065 (XX) and 3160 (XXVIII). Accordingly, the two parties to the dispute should resume negotiations as soon as possible in an effort to find a peaceful, just and lasting solution, as set forth in the draft resolution before the Special Committee.

39. **Ms. Rivero** (Observer for Uruguay) said that, based on the principle of the territorial integrity of States, her country strongly believed that sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands should be restored to Argentina. Uruguay had always upheld the right to self-determination, but that right applied not to States, but to peoples. Moreover, it applied, not to all peoples, but to indigenous peoples. The inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands were not indigenous peoples. Uruguay joined with the international community in calling on the two parties to resume negotiations in order to find a peaceful, just and lasting solution to the dispute, taking due account of the interests of the population of the islands.

40. **Mr. Zhang** Yishan (China) said his country had always believed that territorial disputes between countries should be resolved through peaceful negotiations. He hoped that the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom would act in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, continue their constructive dialogue, and work to achieve an early, peaceful and just solution to the question. His delegation therefore supported the draft resolution.

41. **Mr. Aranibar Quiroga** (Bolivia) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with the statement made by the representative of Paraguay on behalf of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR) and associated countries, as well as the statement made by the representative of Brazil on behalf of the Rio Group, and called on Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations on the question of the Malvinas Islands.

42. Recalling that in 1985 the General Assembly had decided to address the question of the Malvinas Islands on the basis of the principle of the sovereignty of States, rather than that of the right of peoples to self-determination, and that the Special Committee had repeatedly called on the two Governments to resume the search for a peaceful, just and lasting solution, he urged all delegations present to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

43. **Mr. Mana-Kpukumu** (Sierra Leone) said that the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) should be resolved through a peaceful and negotiated settlement and urged the parties to engage in a sustained dialogue in order to find a lasting solution, which notably respected the wishes of the people who had lived on the islands for over 160 years.

44. The General Assembly had affirmed, in its resolution 637 (VII), of December 1952 and in subsequent resolutions, its commitment to recognizing self-determination as a prerequisite for resolving all fundamental human rights questions. The people had the right to self-determination, and any solution that

failed to reflect the aspirations of the islanders would be inconsistent with Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as paragraph 4 of the Millennium Declaration.

45. **Mr. Mekdad** (Syrian Arab Republic, Rapporteur) said that the position of his country was consistent with that taken at the recent summit of South American and Arab countries held in Brasilia. His delegation supported the draft resolution before the Special Committee, for it was convinced that the resumption of dialogue between the two countries concerned would lead to a solution that would be acceptable to all the parties.

46. **Ms. Asmady** (Indonesia) said that the Special Committee had always recognized that universal criteria could not be applied to decolonization questions, because every case was unique. The question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) was no exception. In that particular case, and because of its distinct historical background, his delegation was of the view that the principle of territorial integrity should be the first consideration. The relevant General Assembly resolutions clearly stated that the only way to end the colonial situation on the islands was through the peaceful and negotiated settlement of the sovereignty dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom, taking into account the interests of the people of the island. His delegation therefore urged the two countries to resume negotiations in order to find a fair, equitable and durable solution to the problem.

47. **Ms. St. John** (Grenada), reiterating her delegation's commitment to the principle of self-determination and the right of people to decide their own destiny, expressed the hope that by focusing on issues of genuine importance to the islands the United Kingdom and Argentina would be able to resolve that seemingly intractable problem to the benefit of the people of the islands.

48. **Mr. Requeijo Gual** (Cuba) said that the presence of a large number of delegations from South American States testified to their support for Argentina's legitimate rights in the sovereignty dispute over the Malvinas Islands. Argentina and the United Kingdom should resume negotiations as soon as possible, and all measures aimed at prolonging the unnecessary military presence in the region should be ended.

49. **Mr. Fuenmayor** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), reiterating his country's support for Argentina's legitimate rights in the sovereignty dispute over the Malvinas Islands, said that his delegation strongly rejected the inclusion of the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands in Annex II to the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe (overseas countries and territories to which Title IV of Part III of the Constitution applies) as their inclusion represented nothing more than the renewed vindication of Europe's colonial past.

50. **Ms. Mujuma** (United Republic of Tanzania), recalling that her delegation was noted for its unwavering support for the principle of settling any dispute by peaceful means, appealed to all parties involved in the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) to set aside their differences and hold negotiations while taking into consideration the wishes of the people of the islands. Her delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

51. **Mr. Leplinsky** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution and trusted that it would be adopted by consensus. It was necessary to find a mutually agreed solution to the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) through bilateral talks between the two countries concerned, based on the relevant decisions of the General Assembly.

52. **The Chairman** proposed that draft resolution A/AC.109/2005/L.8 should be adopted without a vote.

53. *Draft resolution A/AC.109/2005/L.8 was adopted without a vote.*

54. **The Chairman** announced that the Special Committee had concluded its consideration of the item.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.